

REMARKS

Summary

Claims 1-25 are pending and all of the claims were rejected in the present Office action. Claims 1, 6, 20 and 25 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced.

Rejections

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-2, 6-9, 16, 19 and 24-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujii et al. (US 5,379,033; “Fujii”) in view of Rodriguez et al. (US 7,120,922; “Rodriguez”). Independent Claims 1, 6 and 25 have been amended to further clarify the subject matter claimed. Support for this amendment may be found in the specification as filed at at least para [0025].

Amended Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, that when the reception parameter value is less than a first threshold value, a first operating mode is selected and if the reception parameter is greater than the first threshold value a second operating mode is selected that when the reception parameter is less than the second threshold value, the first operating mode and the second mode are blocked.

The Applicant respectfully submits that Fujii discloses only a single predetermined received signal level to be used as a test to determine the subsequent operation of the system.

Claim 1 recites values of reception parameter, and actions depending on whether the received signal is greater than a first parameter, greater than a second parameter or less than the second parameter. This functionality is not found or suggested in the reference.

The Applicants respectfully submit that nothing in Rodriguez is cited to overcome the deficiencies in the disclosure of Fujii. Moreover, Rodriguez defines the functionality of the disclosed system based primarily on time periods and not on received signal strength. Since one of the systems depends on signal strength, which is a function of distance, and the other of the systems depends on clock time, the combination of the two systems is not obvious. Any suggestion of such a combination must necessarily have arisen from the teachings of the present application as expressed in the claims.

For these reasons independent Claims 1, 6 and 25 are allowable, as are Claims 2-5 and 7-24, which are dependent thereon.

Conclusion

Claims 1-25 are pending.

For at least the reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are allowable and look forward to the early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned in the event that a telephone interview would expedite consideration of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sid Bennett/
Sid Bennett
Registration No. 53,981
Agent for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4726